

have given to equipment and machinery, because they, too, represent our future.

I did not support this last tax cut, and I did not support the tax cut of 2001. I have supported tax cuts in 1993 and 1997 when we balanced the budget. We did not make it an either/or choice.

We can do right by our children; and in fact, when we balanced the budget, cut taxes for working families and middle-class families, and helped them go to college and pay for college, and gave health care to the uninsured children of working parents, we saw a decrease in our rolls of poverty. We saw a decrease in our welfare rolls.

Those are our values that have been enshrined in this country. When we speak to those common set of values that define who we are, we can do right by this country, right by our children, and have those parents dream the American Dream for their children. We should not turn our backs.

What happened here the other day is a shame. People now are pointing fingers. Rather than having pointed fingers, if they had the common decency to think of the children of America, of American families who also, like other families who will get that tax credit, these children deserve the tax credit. They deserve to be held up with the same type of respect that we have held up for corporations that needed to deduct for SUVs, corporations like Enron that needed to be taken care of, corporations that went overseas or deducted for their SUVs.

These children deserve our care and protection. We have not provided them the health care. In fact, we withdrew the money from the States to provide health care for the children of working parents. We do not have a health care plan for the 45 million uninsured. We do not have an agenda for the \$300 billion in unfunded assets.

We have a higher education tax credit that will expire in 2005, just at a time college costs are going up at 10 percent annually. We have inflation in health care rising by 20 percent. Yet all we did was provide corporations a way to depreciate their interest or other forms of tax cuts, but we left 12 million children of working parents out.

Those are not the values that my mother raised us to have, and those are not the values that hold us together as Americans. We can do better. We need to do better. We can put our children first and leave not one of them behind. When it comes to compassion, more than millionaires need compassion; our children need our compassion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SIMMONS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REPUBLICANS' BID TO PRIVATIZE MEDICARE WILL DEGRADE IT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Members may have read in this morning's Roll Call about the personal videotape President Bush sent urging Republicans to seize the moment and overhaul Medicare. Even though privatization will increase costs and degrade the quality of coverage that seniors receive, the President unapologetically is promoting Medicare privatization.

Medicare is enduringly popular with most Americans, including Main Street Republicans; but Medicare is a thorn in the side of conservative extremists. They call it Big Government.

For the majority of Americans who value Medicare, the problem is that those same extremists are now in power. They are using tactics familiar to anyone who has followed the history of another public program, Federal Rail Service. For years, conservative ideologues in office have underfunded Amtrak, the passenger rail system. As train service declines, conservatives insist that Amtrak deserves less funding. Even though every nation in the world subsidizes its public transportation, Congress inadequately invests in and dutifully undermines our national rail system.

In their unrelenting 20-year-old effort to privatize Medicare, begun during the salad days of the Reagan administration, the far right has honed the Amtrak strategy to a science: underfund Medicare; make it more inflexible and bureaucratic; cut basic consumer service functions; lure, then coerce, seniors into private insurance; set this popular program up for failure; then blame any failures on the fact that it is a public program.

When Medicare was enacted in 1965, only 22 Republicans in the House and Senate supported it. Bob Dole, Republican Congressman, voted against it. Donald Rumsfeld, a Republican Congressman, voted against creating Medicare. Gerald Ford, a Republican Congressman then, voted against creating Medicare. Senator Strom Thurman, a Republican Senator then, voted against creating Medicare.

Then in 1995, when the GOP majority had its first chance to reform Medicare, Speaker Gingrich, predicting that Medicare would wither on the vine, attempted to cut \$270 billion from Medicare to make room, get this, for several hundred billion dollars of tax cuts. Sound familiar?

Then came Mediscare. This GOP campaign, launched in the late 1990s, aimed to convince Americans that Medicare is going broke and the only way to save Medicare is to turn it over to private investors. Medicare, they call it Mediscare, Medicare is no more at risk of going broke than is the Defense Department. They are both funded with public dollars.

Forcing Medicare beneficiaries into private insurance plans will not reduce Federal outlays. Per capita spending on Medicare is lower than that on private health insurance, and has been lower than the supposed "efficient" private health service for 30 years. But the push to privatize Medicare has never been grounded in facts; it is an ideological campaign, pure and simple.

Republican leadership simply does not like Medicare. The idea of luring seniors into private health plans grew out of the Medicare+Choice experiment. The +Choice debacle started out innocently enough. The theory was HMOs could operate much more efficiently than traditional Medicare, so they could provide both basic and enhanced benefits for less than the traditional Medicare plan.

It did not work out that way. By selectively enrolling the healthiest seniors, HMOs earned a windfall on the taxpayers' dime. Eventually, that windfall was outstripped by the cost of providing extra benefits. HMOs turned around and asked Congress for more money. The Republican Congress then poured more money into these private managed-care plans, which never covered more than one-sixth of the population, leaving less for the 86 percent of seniors who are enrolled in traditional Medicare.

In other words, Republicans invest more in seniors who agree to join private plans than in six-sevenths of the people in the Medicare plan who stay in traditional Medicare.

President Bush has embraced the Amtrak strategy with even more abandon than his predecessors. Get this: he has proposed establishing a new Medicare prescription drug benefit, but only for seniors who agree to leave traditional Medicare and join private HMO insurance programs. While promoting additional dollars for HMOs, President Bush has taken steps to cut Medicare's already-meager operating funds, to curtail its consumer service functions, and to restrict coverage for medical breakthroughs.

Then Republican leaders in this and the other body dutifully berate Medicare for being inefficient, for being unresponsive, and for being too slow to adapt to 21st century medicine. The Republicans should be ashamed. Medicare has withstood a 30-year Republican effort to dismantle it, but this President is pulling out all the stops. He is preaching Medicare insolvency, he is engaging in Mediscare tactics, he is selling private plans, he is undercutting traditional Medicare, and he is managing traditional Medicare into the ground.

□ 1945

Before the Bush administration privatization train leaves the station, American seniors and those who care about them need to blow the whistle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHOCOLA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon